

June 7, 2019
File: 161413551

Attention: Cody Oram, P.Eng., Senior Engineer
Development Review, South Services Planning
Infrastructure and Economic Development Department
City of Ottawa
110 Laurier Avenue West
Ottawa, ON K1P 1J1

Dear Mr. Oram,

**Reference: Peer Review of Sysco Tannis Facility Stationary Noise Assessment Report -
2300 Stevenage Drive, Ottawa, Ontario**

Stantec Consulting Ltd. (Stantec) was retained by the City of Ottawa to conduct a peer review of the following documents with respect to stationary noise assessment of Sysco Tannis Facility located 2300 Stevenage Drive in Ottawa, Ontario:

- Stationary Noise Assessment of Sysco Tannis - 2390 Stevenage Drive, Ottawa, Ontario (Prepared by Gradient Wind Engineering Inc. (GWE) - Stationary Noise Revision 4), dated February 25, 2019.
- Noise Monitoring Assessment of Sysco Tannis - 2390 Stevenage Drive, Ottawa, Ontario (Prepared by GWE), January 14, 2019.
- Civil, site plan and landscape drawings.
- City's review comments and responses by GWE.

The above reports were prepared in support of a site plan approval from the City for the Facility expansion south of the Facility. The site is in an industrial area between Stevenage Drive and an existing subdivision.

Stantec did not complete a site visit, nor conduct their own independent noise measurements at the site. It is the Owner/Landlord's sole responsibility to determine the noise impacts for the project. Nothing in this peer review shall be considered as a representation by either the author or the City of Ottawa that no noise impacts will occur or that either the author or the City of Ottawa are in any way liable for such impacts regardless of the comments and/or suggestions herein set out. Stantec has reviewed criteria, methodology, receptors, noise sources, conclusions and recommendations provided in the GWE report. Further to our peer review report dated April 30, 2019, the revised Stationary Noise Report – Revision Final R5 dated May 17, 2019 by GWE, is provided in response to our review comments and to provide rationale for the assumptions made by GWE. GWE's responses to the comments are also provided. The revised Stationary Noise Report has provided further clarification to our peer review comments.

It is the Owner/Landlord's sole responsibility to determine the noise impacts for the project. Nothing in this peer review shall be considered as a representation by either the author or the City of Ottawa that no noise impacts will occur or that either the author or the City of Ottawa are in any way liable for such impacts regardless of the comments and/or suggestions herein set out.

Reference: Peer Review of Sysco Tannis Facility Stationary Noise Assessment Report - 2300 Stevenage Drive, Ottawa, Ontario

The focus of this assignment was to consider the stationary noise, with respect to land use planning and environmental legislation. On this basis, we have identified the following outstanding noise concerns. The results of the peer review are summarized below, and they are solely based on the information provided in the aforementioned documents:

- a) The GWE report correctly identifies the applicable Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) guideline NPC-300 and the City of Ottawa Environmental Noise Control Guideline (ENCG).
- b) The acoustic report identifies eight (8) Points of Reception (POR) and they are representative receptors considered for the assessment. The receptors identified for the project include both outdoor and plane of window PORs as required.
- c) The receptor heights considered for the project are appropriate.
- d) The area surrounding the project identified as Class 2 Area which is appropriate for the Project based on the review of the aerial map (e.g., Google Earth).
- e) The model based on the international standard ISO 9613 noise propagation algorithms used for the Project is appropriate for the acoustic assessment.
- f) The noise criteria used in assessing facility operations are the exclusionary sound level limits provided in the guideline for Class 2 areas and they are appropriate in the absence of baseline measurements. Otherwise, higher of the background sound levels or the exclusionary limit should have been considered.
- g) Sound power level calculation formula presented in the report is appropriate, with the exception of the sound power level calculated for the reefer (new unit). Sound power level for the reefer trailers reported looks lower than a typical unit. It is also mentioned in the report that the measurements were completed at a height of 1.5 m and at distance of 2 m. Selection of measurement height might have resulted in the lower sound power level that was used.

The comment above was with reference to the conversion of measured sound levels to sound power levels provided in the noise report (Table A1). However, we have since reviewed the manufacturer's data and updated information provided in the response letter. If manufacturer's data is used for these reefers in the noise model, the calculation seems reasonable. No further comment.

- h) 30 minutes of reefer operations during any 1-hour period in the assumption is unreasonable, they typically run continuous in any 1-hour period.

The comment above has since been reviewed with respect to the supporting document that has since been provided. This document shows that the measurements were conducted on an empty truck on May 6, 2019. If peak operation of these reefers is 30 min during any 1-hour period as described in the report, compliance will not be an issue with 4.5 m high berm in place. However, if these reefers operate more than 30 min, this will potentially put the facility out of compliance and taller berm may be required. Also, we understand that the berm is at the City property and its height is being increased as part of noise mitigation. Typically, noise mitigation is allowed at onsite or facility owned property per MECP.

- i) A calculation check of the facility by Stantec indicates that the GWE noise model under-predicts sound levels at the first row of receptors. This may be due to time weighting used for the reefers and the sound level measurement/calculations mentioned above.

Reference: Peer Review of Sysco Tannis Facility Stationary Noise Assessment Report - 2300 Stevenage Drive, Ottawa, Ontario

- j) The report provides sound power levels for old and new reefer trucks. However, measurement for the old reefer truck is not provided in the report.

The comment above has since been reviewed and the GWE response is acceptable. No further comment.

- k) Building footprint is almost doubled and the report mentioned about addition of coolers for expansion. However, no additional stationary noise source is added to the expansion other than a compactor. Future operation (2029) scenario with 20 Straight Trucks and 27 Reefers is also considered in the assessment. No details on the current mix of trucks/reefer is discussed in report for comparison. A comparison of noise sources for existing and future operations is required to identify the change.

The comment above has since been reviewed and the GWE response is acceptable. No further comment.

- l) It is mentioned in the report that sound levels for the trucks and reefers are measured and that rooftop units are taken from manufacturer's datasheets. There is no information provided on why the existing HVAC unit were not measured.

The comment above has since been reviewed and the GWE response is acceptable. No further comment.

- m) No exhaust fans were discussed in the report or included in the assessment. If they are insignificant sources, they should be listed and provide rationale.

The comment above has since been reviewed and the GWE response is acceptable. No further comment.

- n) The report states the existing noise modelling has good correlation with the measured data. However, noise sources for the existing scenario are not listed in the report.

The comment above has since been reviewed and the GWE response is acceptable. However, the measurements should have been conducted while the upgraded reefers were in use to make correlation with modelling. No further comment.

- o) Broadband backup beepers are recommended at the facility to avoid noise complaints from the neighbours as the peak truck operations are expected during night-time period.

The comment above was to minimize annoyance and complaints by the neighbours. GWE's response on the broadband white noise beepers installation is acceptable. No further comment.

- p) Answers to City's queries on items 59 and 63 (parking configuration considered as mitigation vs. freedom to use any configuration as reported GWE Report, dated January 16, 2019) contradicts each other.

The comment above has since been reviewed and the GWE response is acceptable. No further comment.

June 7, 2019
Cody Oram, P.Eng., Senior Engineer
Page 4 of 4

Reference: Peer Review of Sysco Tannis Facility Stationary Noise Assessment Report - 2300 Stevenage Drive, Ottawa, Ontario

In conclusion, the updated assessment is acceptable and Stantec has no comments. Should you have any questions or if we can be of further assistance please contact the undersigned at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Stantec Consulting Ltd.



Mohammed Salim P.Eng.
Senior Acoustic, Noise, and Vibration Engineer

Phone: 647 680 4162
Mohammed.Salim@stantec.com



Frank Babic P.Eng., INCE
Principal - Acoustics Practice Area Lead Ontario

Phone: 905 369 1018
Frank.Babic@stantec.com

cc. David Yin, Stantec

pk \\cd1215-f01\work_group\01609\active_other_pcs\163302679\planning\report\final
2\let_161413551_coo_2390_stevenage_dr_stationary_noise_rpt_peer_review_20190607_fin.docx